



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

casion of letting the American eagle scream out a narrow and selfish patriotism. Time was killed by the month with unending talk. The chief thought seemed to be how to make political capital out of every measure introduced, out of every speech pronounced. Every member was a sort of Ishmaelite, lifting his hand against every other. Fortunately all earthly things have an end, and it is scarcely to be wondered at that a general sigh of relief went up all over the country when 12 o'clock, the 4th of March, came without the necessity of turning back by a single second the hand of the big Congressional clock.

Next winter, though everything has to be gone over *de novo*, this great question of a treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain will be taken up again. It is pressing for solution; it cannot rest unsolved. God's hand is in it. It is the next great move in international civilization. Hon. E. A. Morse, whose speech in Congress on the naval bill we print on another page, rightly pronounces Mr. Cremer's memorial "altogether the most wonderful memorial that ever crossed the ocean." It is just as true that the subject with which it deals is altogether the most important that either Congress or the House of Commons has ever had to deal with. The effects of such a treaty would be inconceivably far-reaching in promoting the civilization of the world, and we shall hope that when the next Congress meets in December, one of the first things done by our Representatives will be to express themselves strongly in its favor. It is true that the President and the Senate may make the treaty without consulting the House, but it would add very great strength to it, when made, if the House should strongly recommend it beforehand.

MR. CREMER'S ACCOUNT OF HIS MISSION.

In the March number of the *Arbitrator* Mr. Cremer presents an interesting account of his reception at Washington on his recent visit in the interests of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. He states fairly we think, possibly a little too optimistically, the general feeling at Washington and in our country at large as to the proposed treaty. Our readers will be glad to have his own words which we here give, omitting an introductory paragraph:

"But what about your success, my impatient readers will exclaim. Well, those who sneered and predicted failure proved themselves false prophets; and those who expected me to bring back in my pocket a treaty signed and sealed will be disappointed—but, patience, my good friends, patience; wait a little longer, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, or some untoward circumstances occur, the time is not far distant when you will see the fruition of our hopes. That there are still difficulties to be overcome I do not deny. Opponents, open and covert, are to be found in our own Parliament and in the Congress of the United States; but as both Governments are favor-

able to the conclusion of a treaty, the prospect is good, and the chances of their efforts being frustrated by opponents are not such as to give rise to serious apprehension. I had no difficulty in gaining access to the President, the interview being arranged by the Secretary of State, Mr. Gresham, a gentleman whose character and noble nature is stamped in every feature. My first conference with Mr. Gresham lasted nearly an hour, and, although I am not at liberty to repeat what transpired, I can say that no more earnest, enthusiastic supporter of our cause could be found on either side of the Atlantic, and the impression I then formed was fully confirmed at two subsequent meetings I had with the hon. gentleman. My interview with President Cleveland was equally gratifying; it lasted just one hour; we were quite alone; there was an entire absence of officialism or restraint. The President talked of our visit seven years ago and enquired after some of the then deputation. In presenting the memorial I explained the reasons which prompted the memorialists to address him, and pointed to the number of influential names appended to it. The President appeared to be fairly well acquainted with the debate upon my motion in the House of Commons, but not with the reasons which induced Mr. Gladstone to suggest alterations in the motion. That I explained as best I could. Concerning the probable attitude of our Government upon the subject I was able to speak reassuringly. The best way of getting a treaty drafted and agreed to was also—but here again silence is imposed upon me, and all I can say is that I was perfectly satisfied with the information imparted to me. As a souvenir of the occasion the President gave me a copy—in which he wrote his autograph with the day of the month which, he observed, would serve to remind us of the date of our interview—of the message which he had sent to Congress after the resolution of the House of Commons, in which message he had urged the subject upon the attention of Congress.

"My reception by members of both Houses of Congress was not less cordial. The floor of the Senate, and of the House of Representatives, was graciously accorded me. The Committees on Foreign Relations in both Houses favored me with an interview and discussed the object of my mission. In the Committee of the House I was almost bombarded with questions, and the only unpleasant incident which happened during the whole of my visit occurred on that occasion. As, however, the member, Mr. Van Voorhis, whose questions and extraordinary manner caused the unpleasantness, has since declared in Congress that he had no intention of being offensive to me, and has written me a letter to that effect, I will not further allude to the incident than to say, that the letter which the hon. member has addressed to me bristles with anomalies, contradictions, apologies and reiterations.

"At the present moment there are two resolutions and a Bill upon the subject before Congress. The resolution of Mr. Coombs will be found on another page; the other is that of Senator Allison, to which reference has been frequently made in previous numbers of the *Arbitrator*. The Bill has been introduced by Senator Sherman, but as Congress adjourns at the end of February, and will not reassemble until December next, the prospect of either resolutions or Bill being discussed this year is very remote, especially as they have been referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations. But the adoption by Congress of either resolutions or Bill is not absolutely necessary. Of course, if Congress requested the President to

open up negotiations with our Government his hands would be strengthened, but he has the power to prepare a treaty without any authorization by Congress, and it would not surprise me to learn that the Secretary of State is already engaged with our Ambassador at Washington, Sir Julian Pauncefote, in drafting such a treaty. The task is by no means so easy as some sanguine friends imagine. My visit has made me better acquainted with the delicate and difficult character of the undertaking; but we are fortunate in having as our Ambassador there Sir Julian Pauncefote, as I know from interviews with him that the conclusion of a treaty is a subject dear to his heart. The Secretary of State is equally in earnest upon the matter, and if they undertake the task, I feel sure they will succeed. The draft of the treaty would then have to be submitted to our Government for their consideration and ratification. If the present Government is in office when the treaty is prepared there will probably be little difficulty in the way of its being ratified. I know this is a bold assertion, but it is not recklessly made. In the United States the House of Representatives has no treaty making power, but the Senate has, and before a treaty can be operative it must be submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, who can recommend its acceptance or rejection by the Senate. When a treaty is being discussed the Senate meet *in camera*, and a two-thirds vote of the members suffices for its ratification. Supposing, then, that the President causes a treaty to be prepared, and sends it to the Senate, what prospect is there of its being endorsed? That was a question which I naturally asked myself, upon which I consulted a number of Senators; and should have consulted a great many more but for my recall home. Well, the result of my enquiries upon the point was highly satisfactory: nearly every Senator with whom I conferred expressed his firm conviction that the Senate would be sure to ratify such a treaty. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator Morgan, was still more emphatic, and in a long private interview I had with him, said he was certain that in ten days a treaty could be passed through all its stages in the Senate. On the first of March, the complexion of the Senate will, however, be somewhat changed owing to the recent elections, and what effect the change may have upon our prospects no one can at present tell. Time and space prevent any further amplification of these notes, except to add that my recall prevented me from responding to pressing invitations which I received to address meetings in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston, Chicago, etc. I ought not, however, to forget and acknowledge the signal service which the Press rendered to our cause. Immediately on landing at New York four reporters button-holed me, and others followed me to the hotel. I have nearly 200 Press clippings, some of them containing amusing descriptions of my personal appearance, concerning which, by-the-by, no two of them were agreed. Most of the journals which commented upon my mission did so in a friendly, sympathetic manner, but a few others manifested a spirit of hostility. If, however, the American Press interviewer bores you, he serves a useful purpose by advertising your mission."

W. R. C.

The ex-Queen of Hawaii has been sentenced to five years of imprisonment. The sentences of the leaders in the conspiracy against the government have been commuted by President Dole to imprisonment.

KINDNESS TOWARD ANIMALS, MERCY TOWARD HUMAN BEINGS.

Mr. Angell of the American Humane Education Society pretends to believe in "the sword as a humane educator." Here is one of the most recent utterances of his usually kind and merciful pen, like which we have occasionally noticed others in *Our Dumb Animals*:

Because we would teach every child in America to be kind to all *that deserve kindness*, it does not follow that we believe in *only one kind* of humane education.

When Napoleon put an end to the mobs of Paris by ordering *grape shot* fired *first*, from his cannon, and *afterward, blank cartridges*, he really did a most merciful act.

The Chicago policeman who first hurled to the ground a brutal cattle drover who was whipping a sick sheep, and then *sat down on top of him*, pulled out a copy of the laws of Illinois, and delivered a lecture on cruelty to animals, was the best kind of a humane educator that the case admitted of.

There are few events of our own life that we look back upon with more pleasure than one in which we broke a stout hickory cane over the back of a street bully who was insulting peaceable passers-by.

There are two kinds of humane education, and until we get a little nearer the millennium the sword may have to be sometimes used in one of them.

It strikes us as painfully incongruous that those engaged in the noble work of cultivating in society a kind and tender spirit toward *animals* should unwittingly allow themselves to be teaching the children who read their words a spirit of vindictiveness toward *human beings*, and we can with difficulty believe that the kind-hearted, strong and brave editor of *Our Dumb Animals* really holds the principle seemingly defended in the foregoing citation.

Are the children of the twenty thousand Bands of Mercy to be led to believe that one of the pleasantest things to remember is the breaking of hickory canes over the backs of bullies? Are they to be expected to go about prepared to chastise every one whom they chance to find inflicting wrong upon man or beast? If only those "*that deserve kindness*" are to be treated kindly, what is to become of the Christ-spirit which humane education seeks to instil? The mercy which Jesus Christ teaches and exemplified is a very different principle of conduct from that which prompts you to "love them that love you," or simply "to be kind to those that deserve kindness." The sword of humane education which Peter drew to smite down the bullies who had come to carry away and abuse and kill his Master, was quietly but firmly sent back to its scabbard.

Kindness toward "a sick sheep" is a praiseworthy and beautiful thing, but "how much better is a man than a sheep," even the kind of sinful men for whom Christ died. Jesus would have protested with all the earnestness of his pure and tender nature, but possibly without words even, against the conduct of the brutal cattle drover, but